

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 and 10-25 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claim 9 has been canceled and claims 16-25 have been added. Claims 1, 4 and 22 are independent claims.

The specification, abstract, claims and drawings have been amended to correct informalities, to clarify the invention, to improve form and to provide a more consistent disclosure according to the U.S. practice. These modifications are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not add any new matter.

Abstract

At the Examiner's request, a new Abstract is provided.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This claim has been revised to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, the rejection must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10 and 12-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tullis (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,243). Claims 1, 3, 7 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,380,975). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 4, the Examiner alleges that Tullis and Suzuki disclose a PC camera as recited in the body of these claims. However, what Tullis and Suzuki disclose is not a PC camera, but a handheld-type digital camera. The term "PC camera" is a well-established term known to one skilled in the art and is different from a portable handheld-type digital camera known in the art. Applicants' embodied invention provides a PC camera that is capable of operating as a portable handheld digital camera independently from a PC when the PC camera is electrically separated from the PC and thus provides a more versatile and effective PC camera.

Accordingly, Suzuki's portable digital camera and Tullis' portable digital camera cannot be equated to Applicants' PC camera as recited in independent claims 1 and 4. As such, independent claims 1 and 4 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejections must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 6-7, 9 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Suzuki. Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,657,654). Claim 15 has been rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tullis in view of Suzuki and further in view of Ando (U. S. Patent No. 4,887,798). These rejections, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Tullis and Suzuki, either taken singularly or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the PC camera as recited in independent claims 1 and 4 from which claims 6-7, 11 and 14-15 depend. Further, neither Narayanaswami nor Ando corrects this deficiency since Narayanaswami discloses a camera for use with a PDA and Ando et al. discloses a video telephone to be used over telephone exchange lines. Therefore, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest the PC camera as recited in independent claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 4 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejections must be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 16-21 further define the invention as recited in independent claim 1 and are thus patentable at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable as discussed above. Independent claim 22 and its dependent claims 23-25 emphasize the distinguishing features of the applied references. For instance, none of the applied references teaches a PC camera that operates as an independent handheld digital camera when a detector of the PC camera

detects that the PC camera is electrically separated from a PC. These claims are thus believed to be patentable over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By *Esther H. Choy #40,953*
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

JTE/EHC:lmh:adt

Attachments: Abstract of the Disclosure
Substitute Specification
Mark-Up Copy of Sub. Specification
Replacement Sheets of corrected formal Figs. 2A, 2B, 11 & 12